

Exhibit A

From: Delete Lawz <deletelawz@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 23, 2022 6:33 PM
To: Wish, Benjamin
Subject: Re: DeCastro/Abrams

I hate to tell you this Benny, however, the federal rules of procedures aren't my choice. I don't have to waive my rights and Im not waiving my rights.

I'm sorry you didn't study hard enough in law school to know the basic federal rules of civil procedure.

I was hoping to learn from you during this trial. I'm certainly learning how the unethical side of law is done.

your emergency motion will be denied. We will fight this case based on the merits of the substance.

I sent you a document so that I could begin my amended complaint for your unethical Side, to save time. You requested the amended complaint so I sent you a document to get it to you as quickly as possible. I just want to litigate it out based on the merits of the case

It sure seems like Kate hired the right lawyer. You are perfect for them. Memberships for the Masshole Troll Mafia are perfect.

Let's burn through that 50 grand she's giving you so that we can just get to the settlement part

I'll see you at court.

Good Day

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 23, 2022, at 3:21 PM, Wish, Benjamin <bwish@toddweld.com> wrote:

Mr. DeCastro,

The status conference was to discuss the substance of the emergency motion I filed. The court notified of the hearing, as set out in the transcript which you have in hand. I notified you of the hearing by email. You and I discussed the hearing immediately before it was to begin via telephone. You chose not to attend based on your claim that you did not receive proper service.

Ben

Benjamin J. Wish
Todd & Weld LLP
One Federal Street, Boston, MA 02110
T: 617-624-4786
www.ToddWeld.com

On Oct 23, 2022, at 6:10 PM, Delete Lawz <deletelawz@gmail.com> wrote:

You got me on this one. Im not sure so You held an ex pate, status conference hearing With one party? And.... and thats now done?

Hmmmmmm. I wonder how that's even possible. I thought a status conference was between the parties involved or the parties lawyers?

Maybe I'm confused or...

Once again, you're showing your unethical behavior. I'm keeping track of everything to file a proper complaint with the bar that I will then follow up on.

You can't have a status conference hearing when I'm not there and I don't have a representative there.

Sowwy-Unethical-Benny.

Status conference

Status conference is a meeting that occurs before trial where attorneys from opposing [parties](#) and sometimes a judge meet. The nature of a status conference often will depend on the type of case. A status conference in a [criminal case](#) will often consist of [prosecution](#) and [defense](#) attorneys exchanging [evidence](#), but they sometimes may involve discussing [plea bargains](#). In [civil cases](#), status conferences can involve exchanging evidence, [stipulating](#) to certain terms, and starting negotiations on a [settlement agreement](#). Sometimes a judge will attend a status conference to give their opinion on [plea](#) or settlement offers and setting timelines for other pre-trial matters.

Maybe educate me how that's possible. Please.

Thanks
Jose

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 23, 2022, at 11:38 AM, Wish, Benjamin <bwish@toddweld.com> wrote:

Mr. DeCastro,

Also, just a reminder that we do have a hearing tomorrow at noon, as reflected in the Court's 10/21 order which you have seen.

Ben

Benjamin J. Wish
Todd & Weld LLP
One Federal Street, Boston, MA 02110
T: 617-624-4786
www.ToddWeld.com

On Oct 23, 2022, at 2:33 PM, Wish, Benjamin
<bwish@toddweld.com> wrote:

Mr. DeCastro,

I'm writing just to correct one point in the below. I will not address all of your claims and statements, which are almost uniformly wrong.

The court held an emergency status conference already, on Thursday, 10/18/2022, in response to Ms. Peter's motion for such a conference. You chose not to attend based on your claim that you had not received proper service.

I'm always happy to confer about any dispute or potential dispute in the hopes of avoiding motion practice.

Thank you.

Ben

From: Delete Lawz <deletelawz@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 23, 2022 2:21 PM
To: Wish, Benjamin <bwish@toddweld.com>
Subject: Re: DeCastro/Abrams

Mr. DeCastro,

I take your email response to mean that you are refusing to confer with me regarding a Ms. Peter's contemplated motion for a finding of contempt. If I have that wrong, please do let me know. ---
- **Contemplate it or file it -- I'll oppose it and**

show that Ms. Peter made a video speaking in depth about essentially the same thing my video stated. AND, raised \$30,000. It is my belief that you will do everything in your power to avoid the merits of this case.

The Court has not denied, or allowed, any of the pending motions. **No. The judge has made it clear that she is NOT going to have an Emergency Hearing. Why would she? She makes hours long videos, lying about She also ordered mutual restraint which is what I asked for in my first motion.**

I was seeking to resolve your discovery motion, about which we had been conferring, and as to which I had thought we had reached agreement. **Uh, no. We didn't. You haven't taken a single action to move towards filing a response. I want to have my day in court and you keep trying to avoid that. I've wanted to speak about the merits of the case and you replied that you don't know them. Baaaah**

That is all. If you insist on pursuing a claim of spoliation where we have not even had a 26(f) conference, that is your prerogative, but I would suggest that it is a waste of the Court's time and the parties' respective resources. **Spoilation did occur. What are you talking about? The evidence was spoiled and then evidence was destroyed. Motion for Spoilation stands. You might wanna read the motion instead of writing me. Instead of getting the 411 from you paralegal or assistant, you might read that motion.**

Your accusation or belief that I am seeking to "scare" a witness is unfounded and wrong. Particularly given your behavior towards the witness, your accusations are not credible. **My behavior towards trying to protect his identity and you releasing unredacted transcripts that have his name in them? Can we talk about that? Or, the paid Troll who wasn't really sure**

what he was supposed to do once he had gotten close to me; after being PAID to get close to me. My behavior included, "Write me a truthful affidavit or I'll have to file a subpoena" Man, that's just awful trying to help him stay anonymous. Since you released his name, it's worthy of additional sanctions and jury instructions.

Your apparent decision to block my emails will make it impractical for us to litigate this case as efficiently as possible. **It also forces you to put absolutely everything in writing. I'm doing this in an attempt to curb your unethical actions and behaviors.**

That is unfortunate. **Yes, it is. Act ethically and I'd love to litigate the merits of this case; not this nonsense.**

To the extent the Court does not dismiss the Complaint - **Not a Chance. This case has merit and it will not be dismissed.**

there will be many occasions on which you and I need to seek to work cooperatively separate and apart from motion practice and other court filings. I **asked the court Clerk how parties confer without phone or email & they didn't have an answer. It's something we want to discuss with the judge. Work Cooperatively? Okay, how about we set up our first conference and you reply to my complaint so I can serve my amended complaint?**

Please do let me know if you reconsider. **Okay. I've thought about it. No. I will not reconsider. Unless the judge straightens you out, Ben. I've tried to confer with you about this case and on the two occasions we talked, you knew nothing about the merits of the case. Do your job and I'm willing to confer, amicably, peacefully, anytime. However, I'm not stopping until your**

client removes all videos and pays me for lifetime damages.

I am not responding comprehensively, or to each of the points in your email below. Please do not interpret my lack of response as a concession. **Lack of response? Lack of effort to know anything about this case. Communicating with you has not led to anything other than you filing motions to lead away from the actual merits of the case OR (when I do speak with you) you tell me you don't know the merits of the case. You keep trying to delay conferring with me about my motions to.... to simply delay my motions. It's been ruff, Ben. And, I think you acting inappropriately. You're acting like the Troll Mafia you are representing and I'll simply follow the FRCP.**

Maybe we can have a call twice a week? Maybe we could just schedule calls on a shared calendar? I sure would like to get our first conference and have a reply to my complaint.

Thank you, and be well.
Thanks!

Ben
Jose

On Sun, Oct 23, 2022 at 10:48 AM Wish, Benjamin
<bwish@toddweld.com> wrote:

Mr. DeCastro,

I take your email response to mean that you are refusing to confer with me regarding Ms. Peter's contemplated motion for a finding of contempt. If I have that wrong, please do let me know.

The Court has not denied, or allowed, any of the pending motions.

I was seeking to resolve your discovery motion, about which we had been conferring, and as to which I had thought we had reached agreement. That is all. If you insist on pursuing a claim of spoliation where we have not even had a 26(f) conference, that is your prerogative, but I would suggest that it is a waste of the Court's time and the parties' respective resources.

Your accusation or belief that I am seeking to "scare" a witness is unfounded and wrong. Particularly given your behavior towards the witness, your accusations are not credible.

Your apparent decision to block my emails will make it impractical for us to litigate this case as efficiently as possible. That is unfortunate. To the extent the Court does not dismiss the Complaint, there will be many occasions on which you and I need to seek to work cooperatively separate and apart from motion practice and other court filings. Please do let me know if you reconsider.

I am not responding comprehensively, or to each of the points in your email below. Please do not interpret my lack of response as a concession.

Thank you, and be well.

Ben

From: Chille DeCastro <iamalaskan@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 23, 2022 1:37 PM
To: Wish, Benjamin <bwish@toddweld.com>
Subject: Re: DeCastro/Abrams

Mr Wish

Its been determined you're unethical. You asked me to remove my motion for sanctions AFTER you knew your motion to dismiss would not be approved.

You're were trying to take advantage of me not know about the Judges Order; filed 13 minutes previously.

You also released the un redacted transcripts revealing John Doe's name. I believe, in attempt to scare the witness, who has stated he is scared of the Troll Mafia, you released his name.

Expect a BAR Complaint.

BECAUSE of your unethical moves, All your emails are now blocked.

Please Communicate following FRCP for a pro se litigant who is not on EFC.

Respectfully,

Jose M DeCastro

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 23, 2022, at 9:43 AM, Wish, Benjamin <bwish@toddweld.com> wrote:

Mr. DeCastro,

Ms. Peter is contemplating filing a motion for contempt based upon certain statements you made in YouTube videos on Friday and yesterday which violate the Court's order including, among other statements, promising to keep coming and never relent, no matter how long it takes, until Ms. Peter is "done."

I am available to confer today at your convenience if you are available.

As a courtesy, I do want to let you know that given the hearing tomorrow at 12 PM EST I intend to make the Court aware of your violations of the Court's order, as well as your intentional misrepresentations of the Court's rulings.

Please let me know if you are available to confer.

Thank you.

Benjamin J. Wish (he/him/his)



Todd & Weld LLP

One Federal Street, Boston, MA 02110

www.toddweld.com

This e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is intended only for the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me by return e-mail and permanently delete the original and any copy of this e-mail message and any printout thereof.

To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, we inform you that any U.S. tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding U.S. tax penalties.

This e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is intended only for the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me by return e-mail and permanently delete the original and any copy of this e-mail message and any printout thereof.

To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, we inform you that any U.S. tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding U.S. tax penalties.

This e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is intended only for the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me by return e-mail and permanently delete the original and any copy of this e-mail message and any printout thereof.

To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, we inform you that any U.S. tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding U.S. tax penalties.

This e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is intended only for the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me by return e-mail and permanently delete the original and any copy of this e-mail message and any printout thereof. To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, we inform you that any U.S. tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding U.S. tax penalties.